

REMARKS:

Claims 1-46 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claims 1-6, 11, 15, 16, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 36, 39, and 41-46 stand rejected as anticipated. Claims 7-10, 12-14, 17-26, 29, 32, 33, 37, 38, and 40 stand rejected as obvious.

Claims 11, 27, 35, 36, 41, and 45 have been amended. Claim 31 has been canceled. Claims 1-30 and 32-46 are presented for examination.

Entry of Preliminary Amendment

Applicants thank Examiner Klinger for his telephone message of March 18, 2004 confirming that the Preliminary Amendment filed May 9, 2003 was entered.

Drawings

Applicants respectfully bring to the Examiner's attention that the Examiner did not provide an indication whether the drawings (as originally filed and amended by the Preliminary Amendment of May 9, 2003) are accepted or objected to. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner provide such an indication in the next action so that Applicants may timely address any issues.

Rejection of Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112 citing insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "said user device", "said data", "said presentation requirements", and "said presentation scheme".

Applicants have amended Claim 35 to provide proper antecedent bases for the limitations "said user device" and "said data". However, with regard to the limitations "said presentation requirements" and "said presentation scheme",

Applicants respectfully submit that proper antecedent bases are present for these limitations.

In particular, proper antecedent basis for the limitation "said presentation requirements" is provided in the element "identifying presentation requirements of said user device" (Application, Claim 35, page 42, lines 36-37). Further, proper antecedent basis for the limitation "said presentation scheme" is provided in the element "selecting a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes" (Application, Claim 25, page 43, lines 1-2).

Applicants respectfully submit Claim 35 as amended provides proper antecedent bases for the above cited limitations and overcomes the Examiner's rejection. As no further rejections or objections to Claim 35 were raised by the Examiner in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 35.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Bickmore

Claims 1-6, 11, 15, 16, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 36, 39, and 41-46 were rejected as anticipated by Bickmore et al. ("Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users", herein Bickmore).

Claims 1 and 2-6

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2-6.

Applicants' Claim 1 recites in part at least:

selecting a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements wherein upon application of said presentation scheme to said data, new data presentable on said user device is generated.

In the Office Action, at page 3, the Examiner stated that Bickmore shows:

(s)electing a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements wherein upon application of said presentation scheme to said data, new data presentable on said user device is generated.

In support of the above proposition, in the Office Action at page 3, the Examiner particularly cited to Bickmore at section 3.1, paragraph 1, page 536:

"Figure 1 shows the flow of documents among the user, Digestor and the web server. Reauthored documents (each usually partitioned into many smaller pages) are cached to improve efficiency";

and, in the Office Action, at page 4, to Bickmore at section 3.1, paragraph 3, page 536:

"Digestor also supports cellular phones that have very small text displays. Many cellular phones cannot display images. They also do not support links embedded in the text. Instead, they provide programmable buttons that can be used for navigation. Figure 3 illustrates Digestor's reauthoring capability for a cellular phone display."

Immediately preceding the reference to the above citation, Bickmore at section 3.1, paragraph 1, page 536, describes:

Digestor intercepts requests for web pages and returns re-authored versions rather than the original pages. The first thing that users of Digestor will typically do is specify the size of display for their device and indicate the size of their default browser font; these are required in order to estimate the screen area requirements of the text blocks. Once users have configured the system they can start retrieving documents from the web.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above citations to Bickmore describe transfer of a re-authored page that has been

re-authored in accordance with a single presentation scheme and not "selecting a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements" (emphasis added) as recited in part in Applicants' Claim 1.

Specifically, Fig. 1 of Bickmore illustrates a "1. Request for URL" sent to a "Digester HTTP Proxy" (emphasis added). A "2 Request for WWW page" (emphasis added) is sent to a "Web Server". A "3. WWW page" (emphasis added) is sent to "Digester ReAuthoring". "4. Re-authored page elements" (emphasis added) exit from "Digester ReAuthoring" and a "5. First page" (emphasis added) is "delivered" to a "User".

Also illustrated in Fig. 1 is "4. Re-authored page elements" (emphasis added) are sent to a "Cache" and that a "6. Page Request" (emphasis added) from a "User" results in "7. Cached page delivered" (emphasis added) to the "User".

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the above citation to Bickmore describes that a page request sent to a Digester HTTP proxy results in a page re-authored in accordance with a single presentation scheme, i.e., a single presentation scheme pre-configured by the user for the size of display for their device and the size of their default browser font.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the "page elements" illustrated in Fig. 1 of Bickmore refer to the "many smaller pages" a re-authored document is "usually partitioned into" and which can be "cached to improve efficiency", and do not represent "a plurality of presentation schemes" as recited in part in Applicants' Claim 1.

In regard to the Examiner's citation to Bickmore at section 3.1, paragraph 3, page 536, Applicants respectfully submit that the citation to Bickmore does not describe "selecting a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements" as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 1, but

rather simply the re-authoring of a web page for a cellular phone. Indeed, Bickmore in the Abstract at page 534 describes:

Two versions of Digestor have been deployed, one that reauthors HTML into HTML for conventional browsers and one that converts HTML into HDML for Phone.com's micro-browsers.

Applicants respectfully submit that at most the citations to Bickmore describe that the Digestor system utilizes a single presentation scheme to re-author pages, i.e., HTML to HTML or separately HTML to HDML, and do not describe "selecting a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 1.

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 1 is distinguishable over Bickmore and is not anticipated by and is patentable over Bickmore.

As Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1, Applicants submit that for at least the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 1, Claims 2-6 are also not anticipated by and are patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-6.

Claims 11, 15 and 16

Applicants have amended Claim 11.

Claim 11, as amended, recites in part at least:

selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes to convert said data from said source data format to said user data format.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 recites at least "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added), and that for at least

the same reasons earlier presented with regard to Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 11 is distinguishable over Bickmore as Bickmore does not describe at least the above recited element of Claim 11.

Thus, based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 11 is not anticipated by and is patentable over Bickmore.

As Claims 15 and 16 depend from Claim 11, Applicants submit that for at least the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 11, Claims 15 and 16 are also not anticipated by and are patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 11, 15, and 16.

Claims 27, 28, 30, 31, and 34

Applicants have amended Claim 27.

Claim 27, as amended, recites at least:

a presentation manager coupled to said web server, said presentation manager further comprising:
a storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of presentation schemes.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 recites at least a presentation manager further comprising "a storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added), and that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 27 is distinguishable over Bickmore as Bickmore does not describe at least the above recited element of Claim 27.

Thus, based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 27 is not anticipated by and is patentable over Bickmore.

As Claims 28, 30, 31, and 34 depend from Claim 27, Applicants submit that for at least the same reasons presented

above with regard to Claim 27, Claims 28, 30, 31, and 34 are also not anticipated by and are patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 27, 28, 30, 31, and 34.

Claim 36

Applicants have amended Claim 36.

Claim 36, as amended, recites at least:

selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes to convert said data from said source data format to said user data format.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 36 recites at least "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added), and that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 36 is distinguishable over Bickmore as Bickmore does not describe at least the above recited element of Claim 36.

Thus, based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 36 is not anticipated by and is patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 36.

Claims 37 and 39

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 37 and dependent Claim 39.

Claim 37 recites at least:

selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes based upon said user MIME type and said source MIME type.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 37 recites at least "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added), and that for at least

the same reasons earlier presented with regard to Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 37 is distinguishable over Bickmore as Bickmore does not describe at least the above recited element of Claim 37.

Thus, based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 37 is not anticipated by and is patentable over Bickmore.

As Claim 39 depends from Claim 37, Applicants submit that for at least the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 37, Claim 39 is also not anticipated by and is patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 37 and 39.

Claims 41 and 42-44

Applicants have amended Claim 41.

Claim 41, as amended, recites at least:

selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes for said content.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 41 recites at least "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added), and that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 41 is distinguishable over Bickmore as Bickmore does not describe at least the above recited element of Claim 41.

Thus, based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 41 is not anticipated by and is patentable over Bickmore.

As Claims 42-44 depend from Claim 41, Applicants submit that for at least the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 41, Claims 42-44 are also not anticipated by and are patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 41-44.

Claim 45

Applicants have amended Claim 45.

Claim 45, as amended, recites at least:

selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes for said content.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 45 recites at least "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added), and that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 45 is distinguishable over Bickmore as Bickmore does not describe at least the above recited element of Claim 45.

Thus, based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 45 is not anticipated by and is patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 45.

Claim 46

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 46.

Claim 46 recites at least:

selecting a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements wherein upon application of said presentation scheme to said data, new data presentable on said user device is generated.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 46 recites at least "selecting a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added), and that

for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to Claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, Claim 46 is distinguishable over Bickmore as Bickmore does not describe at least the above recited element of Claim 46.

Thus, based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 46 is not anticipated by and is patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 46.

Rejection of Claims 7-10 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore

Claims 7-10 and 17-20 were rejected as obvious and unpatentable over Bickmore.

In the Office Action, at page 11, the Examiner stated:

Although Bickmore shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the systems of claim 1 and 11 (see 102 rejections, above), Bickmore does not explicitly show commands. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious application of the system disclosed by Bickmore.

Claims 7-10

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claims 7-10 which depend from Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that, as earlier described with reference to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), hereby incorporated by reference, Bickmore utilizes a single presentation scheme, i.e., a single presentation scheme pre-configured by the user for the size of display for their device and the size of their default browser font, and does not describe or suggest "selecting a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation

requirements" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 1.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit Bickmore teaches away from selection among a plurality of presentation schemes by describing in the Abstract at page 534 deployment of two separate versions of Digestor:

one that reauthors HTML into HTML for conventional browsers and one that converts HTML into HDML for Phone.com's micro-browsers.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Bickmore does not describe or suggest "selecting a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Bickmore.

As Claims 7-10 depend from Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 1, Claims 7-10 are not obvious in view of and are patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 7-10.

Claims 17-20

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claims 17-20 which depend from Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that, for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of Claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), each herein incorporated by reference, Bickmore does not describe or suggest "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 11. Thus,

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 is not obvious in view of Bickmore.

As Claims 17-20 depend from Claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 11, Claims 17-20 are not obvious in view of and are patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 17-20.

Rejection of Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore in view of Miller

Claim 29 was rejected as obvious and unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Miller ("An Introduction to the Resource Description Framework", herein Miller).

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 29 which depends from Claim 27.

In the Office Action at page 12, the Examiner stated:

Although Bickmore shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the presentation manager server system of claim 27 (see 102 rejection above), Bickmore does not show at least one portlet comprises an internal network information portlet. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Bickmore as evidenced by Miller.

Citing to Miller, in the conclusion, the Examiner stated:

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Bickmore so as to use the RDF, such as taught by Miller, in order to improve the access to information by defining a structure for metadata.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of Claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), each herein incorporated by reference,

Bickmore does not describe or suggest at least a presentation manager further comprising at least "a storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 27.

Applicants respectfully submit that Miller describes the Resource Description Framework (RDF) as an "infrastructure that enables the encoding, exchange, and reuse of structured metadata". (Miller, Abstract) Modifying the teaching of Bickmore, which Applicants submit re-authored pages according to a single presentation scheme determined by a user preconfiguration, to support an RDF architecture, would result in at most another separate system for re-authoring pages according to a single presentation scheme determined by a user preconfiguration, and does not describe or suggest a system including a presentation manager further comprising at least "a storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 27. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Miller.

As Claim 29 depends from Claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 27, Claim 29 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Miller.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 29.

Rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore in view of Deach et al.

Claim 12 was rejected as obvious and unpatentable over of Bickmore in view of Deach et al. ("Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) Specification W3C Working Draft 21 Apr 1999", hereinafter Deach).

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 12 which depends from Claim 11.

In the Office Action, page 13, the Examiner stated:

(a)lthough Bickmore shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the method of claim 11 (see 102 rejection, above), Bickmore does not show said selecting a presentation scheme comprises selecting an XSL-stylesheet. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Bickmore as evidenced by Deach.

Citing to Deach, section 1.2, paragraphs 1 and 3, the Examiner stated:

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Bickmore so as to use an XSL-stylesheet to implement the presentation scheme, such as taught by Deach, in order to allow the user to fully control the formatting of the data.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of Claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), each herein incorporated by reference, Bickmore does not describe or suggest "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that Deach describes the Extensible Stylesheet Language (SCL) as "a language for expressing stylesheets." (Deach, Abstract) Modifying the teaching of Bickmore, which Applicants submit re-authored pages according to a single presentation scheme determined by a user preconfiguration, to support the XSL language, would result in at most another separate system for re-authoring pages according to a single presentation scheme determined by a user preconfiguration, and does not describe or suggest "selecting a

presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 11. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Deach.

As Claim 12 depends from Claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 11, Claim 12 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Deach.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 12.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore in view of Freed et al.

Claims 13, 14, 21, 23-26, 37, 38, and 40 were rejected as obvious and unpatentable over of Bickmore in view of Freed (RFC 2046 (sic, 2045), hereinafter Freed).

Referring to claims 13, 14, 21, 27, 38 and 40, in the Office Action, at page 15, the Examiner stated "Bickmore shows substantial features of the claimed invention" and referenced to 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections of Claims 11 and 39.

Further, in the Office Action, at page 15, the Examiner stated:

However, Bickmore does not explicitly show the data formats are MIME types. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious application of the system disclosed by Bickmore as evidenced by Freed.

Citing to Freed, page 3, paragraphs 1 and 4, the Examiner stated:

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of adjusting the system of Bickmore to use MIME data types as the data formats, such as taught by Freed, in order to maintain "compatibility with existing standards AND[for] robustness across existing practice (Freed, page 4, paragraph 8).

Claims 13 and 14

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claims 13 and 14 which depend from Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of Claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), each herein incorporated by reference, Bickmore does not describe or suggest "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that Freed describes Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions, or MIME, as a redefinition of "the format of messages." (Freed, Abstract), e.g., an Internet message protocol. Modifying the teaching of Bickmore, which Applicants submit re-authored pages according to a single presentation scheme determined by a user preconfiguration, to support MIME, would result in at most another separate system for re-authoring pages according to a single presentation scheme determined by a user preconfiguration, and does not describe or suggest "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 11. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Miller.

As Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 11, Claims 13 and 14 are not obvious and are patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 13 and 14.

Claims 21 and 23-26

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claims 21 and 23-26.

Claim 21 recites at least:

selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes based upon said user MIME type and said source MIME type.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 recites at least "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added), and that, for at least the same reasons earlier presented with reference to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of Claims 7-10 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), each herein incorporated by reference, Bickmore does not describe or suggest "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 21. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed.

As Claims 23-26 depend from Claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 21, Claims 23-26 are not obvious and are patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 21 and 23-26.

Claims 37, 38 and 40

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claims 37, 38, and 40.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of Claims 7-10 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), each herein incorporated by reference, Bickmore does not describe or suggest "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 37.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 37 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed.

As Claims 38 and 40 depend from Claim 37, Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 37, Claims 38 and 40 are not obvious and are patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 37, 38, and 40.

Rejection of Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore in view of Freed and in further view of Deach.

Claim 22 was rejected as obvious and unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Freed and further in view of Deach.

In the Office Action, at page 17, the Examiner stated:

Although Bickmore in view of Freed shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the method of claim 21 (see 103 rejection, above), Bickmore in view of Freed does not show said selecting a presentation scheme comprises selecting an XSL-stylesheet. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Bickmore in view of Freed as evidenced by Deach.

Citing to Deach, section 1.2, paragraphs 1 and 3, the Examiner stated:

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Bickmore in view of Freed so as to use an XSL-stylesheet to implement the presentation scheme, such as taught by Deach, in order to allow the user to fully control the formatting of the data.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of Claims 7-10, 12, 21 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), each herein incorporated by reference, Bickmore does not describe or suggest "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 21.

Modifying the teaching of Bickmore, which Applicants submit re-authored pages according to a single presentation scheme determined by a user preconfiguration, in accordance with Freed and Deach, would result in at most separate systems for re-authoring pages according to a single presentation scheme, one for MIME and one for XSL, and does not describe or suggest "selecting a presentation scheme from a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 21. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed and further in view of Deach.

As Claim 22 depends from Claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 21, Claim 22 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed and further in view of Deach.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 22.

Rejection of Claims 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore in view of Jones.

Claims 32 and 33 were rejected as obvious and unpatentable over of Bickmore in view of Jones et al. ("Web-based Messaging Management Using Java Servlets", hereinafter Jones).

In the Office Action, at page 18, the Examiner stated:

Although Bickmore shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the presentation manager server system of claim 27 (see 102 rejection above), Bickmore does not show the use of servlets. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious (addition/modification) to the system disclosed by Bickmore as evidenced by Jones.

Citing to Jones, conclusion, paragraphs 3-7, the Examiner stated:

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the

desirability and advantages of adjusting the system of Bickmore so as to use servlets, such as taught by Jones, in order to take benefit from the cost, security, flexibility, evolution, and performance advantages of servlets.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of Claims 7-10 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), each herein incorporated by reference, Bickmore does not describe or suggest a presentation manager further comprising at least "a storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 27.

Applicants respectfully submit that Jones describes web based messaging management using Java servlets (Jones, Abstract). Modifying the teaching of Bickmore, which Applicants submit re-authored pages according to a single presentation scheme determined by a user preconfiguration, in accordance with Jones, would result in at most a separate system for re-authoring pages according to a single presentation scheme, one that supports Java servlet messaging management, and does not describe or suggest a presentation manager further comprising at least "a storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of presentation schemes" (emphasis added) as recited in part by Applicants' Claim 27. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Jones.

As Claims 32 and 33 depend from Claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons presented above with regard to Claim 27, Claims 32 and 33 are not obvious and are patentable over Bickmore in view of Jones.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 32 and 33.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any

questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants.


CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 24, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants

May 24, 2004
Date of Signature


Lisa A. Norris
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,976
Tel.: (831) 655-0880